

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/937,306 09/20/2001		Michel Auguet	427-047	8402		
47888	7590	10/07/2005		EXAM	INER	
HEDMAN & COSTIGAN P.C. 1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS				MELLER, M	MELLER, MICHAEL V	
NEW YORK				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			1655		

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action								
	Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief							

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/937,306	AUGUET ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Michael V. Meller	1655

		7	1					
	Michael V. Meller	1655						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 August 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A								
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date of								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a								
CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	atutory period for reply originally set in the	final Office action; or (2)	as set forth in (b)					
NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.					
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			because					
<ul> <li>(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>	•	TE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	•	educing or simplifying	the issues for					
appeal; and/or		, , ,						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	, -	jected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(DTOL 004)					
<ul><li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1</li><li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s</li></ul>		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
<ul><li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a</li></ul>		timely filed amendm	nent canceling					
the non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	, -					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .		rill be entered and an	explanation of					
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4 and 8-12</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•							
11. $oxed{oxed}$ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:					
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paner	No(s).						
13. Other:	(	411.41						
	•	Michael V. Meller	<del></del>					

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1655

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons of record. Applicant refers to example 1, column 8 of both of the Naftchi patents but this is not where the patent discloses what is shown in Table II. If applicant instead looks at example 1 in col. 147 of the '933 patent and col. 130 of the '962 patent, applicant will see that this is representative of how the compound 208 is formed. Applicant will notice that as stated in the previous response, 4-methylbenzaldehyde is reacted with guanidine hydrochloride which is exactly what is being shown in table II for the reactants of compound 208. The example 1 in the beginning of the patent at col. 8 of both patents i referring to a reaction which is totally unrelated to the raction compounds shown in Table II. The example applicant is focusing on is for Table I compounds and reactants. Petrus teaches the claimed reactants, see the claims of Petrus. Further, applicant claims that there is no teaching of mixing in the patent, but applicant's own claims do not require mixing since he calims the reactants as "being in separated form". The same is true for the arguements concerning the Lai patent. The previous office action also addressed this patent and the same issues which applicant raises again.